


UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIANOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES

TO: U. S. DISTRICT JUDGE / U. S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE Houston
 FROM: K. Hammerly, Deputy Clerk RECEIVED DATE: 8/22/2008
 CASE NO.: 08cv883 DOCUMENT FILED BY: Plaintiff Hennington, Jr.
 CASE TITLE: Hennington, Jr. V. VA San Diego Healthcare System
 DOCUMENT ENTITLED: Ex Parte Application for Default Judgment

Upon the submission of the attached document(s), the following discrepancies are noted:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local Rule	Discrepancy
<input type="checkbox"/> 5.1	Missing time and date on motion and/or supporting documentation
<input type="checkbox"/> 5.3	Document illegible or submitted on thermal facsimile paper
<input type="checkbox"/> 5.4	Document not filed electronically. Notice of Noncompliance already issued.
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.1 or 47.1	Date noticed for hearing not in compliance with rules/Document(s) are not timely
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.1 or 47.1	Lacking memorandum of points and authorities in support as a separate document
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.1 or 47.1	Briefs or memoranda exceed length restrictions
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.1	Missing table of contents
<input type="checkbox"/> 15.1	Amended pleading not complete in itself
<input type="checkbox"/> 30.1	Depositions not accepted absent a court order
<input type="checkbox"/>	Supplemental documents require court order
<input type="checkbox"/>	Default Judgment in sum certain includes calculated interest
X	<u>OTHER: 5.1 Improper Format; 5.2 Missing Proof of Service</u>

Date forwarded: 8/25/2008

ORDER OF THE JUDGE / MAGISTRATE JUDGE**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:**

The document is to be filed nunc pro tunc to date received.

The document is NOT to be filed, but instead REJECTED. and it is ORDERED that the Clerk serve a copy of this order on all parties.

Rejected document to be returned to pro se or inmate? Yes. Court Copy retained by chambers

Counsel is advised that any further failure to comply with the Local Rules may lead to penalties pursuant to Local Rule 83.1

CHAMBERS OF: Houston

By: 21

Dated: 8/26/08

cc: All Parties

1 Ex-Parte Application
2 for Default - Judgment
3 **REJECTED**
4 TO the Honorable Judge
5 John A. Houston [ATTENTION]
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
8

11 ALvin Hennington JR.
12 Plaintiff,
13 vs.
14 U.S. Government At, A V.A.,
San Diego Healthcare
System Defendant.
15

CASE NO. 08cv0883-
WQH AJB

16 Request Court Judgment
17 in the Amount of \$175 million
18 Dollars,
19 Against Defendants Names:
20

21 V.A. San Diego Health care
22 System, For Plaintiff,
23
24
25
26
27
28 ALvin Hennington JR.